

index data over said network.

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 remain in the application and have been amended hereby.

Claims 1-39 have been amended in part to change all occurrences of "said image" to "--said digital image--", as requested in the Office Action at paragraph 3.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-39 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. in view of Garfinkle et al.

A feature of the present invention is to transfer a digital image with a handling condition in a digital data format stored in a server to a receiver side via an Internet line. The digital image data transferred via the Internet line is developed into a printed picture and modified based on the handling condition. See Figs. 24 and 25 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ginter et al. in view of Garfinkle et al. fails to show or suggest transferring a digital image with a handling condition in a digital data format stored in a server to a receiver side via an Internet line so that the digital image data transferred via the Internet line is developed into a printed picture and modified

based on the handling condition.


Ginter et al. is merely a system for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection and, as conceded in the Office Action at paragraph 6, does not show or suggest a photographic image printing machine or a photographic image scanner and Garfinkle et al. is cited as curing this deficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that Garfinkle et al. is silent about distributing via an Internet line a digital picture to be developed into a printed picture based on a handling condition transmitted by a reception host. Garfinkle et al. is merely scanning and distributing a developed photographic print.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 and 18, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Ginter et al. in view of Garfinkle et al.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Jay H. Maioli", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213
Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

JHM/PCF:tb